

207. 1985

Fineman: Would you think that Buffalo might be a good place to try an experiment in that?

Dole: Buffalo, Kansas?

Fineman: New York.

Dole: There are a lot of Buffaloes around, but that ought to be a good spot. And I could name another one, two, or maybe three more. One in Tennessee, one in Texas, one in Kansas and one in Connecticut.

Povich: One of the other things the president talked about in his State of the Union were proposals that have come up a number of times on a Constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. Do you see any fire for that one?

Dole: There should be a lot of fire. It would be my view that a lot of Democrats who have opposed the Constitutional amendment on the theory that it might help Ronald Reagan get reelected can be objective about it now because he is not going to run again. There could be a Democrat in the White House some time soon—hopefully, not too soon—so it's not a political issue. It ought to be passed, and I would hope some of the Democrats would think about it seriously, as well as the line item veto.

Povich: Doesn't it strike you as somewhat of a dichotomy for a man who comes up to Capitol Hill with \$180 billion in-the-red budget to ask for a balanced budget amendment?

Dole: You have to shift gears fairly quickly on that one, but the president is good at that. And, again, he is looking at history. He is not looking at his administration because, by the time you had a balanced budget amendment passed by three-fourths of the states, it could take two, three, or four years before it is implemented. So, I commend the president for pushing for it. It is not going to help his administration, but it's going to help whoever may be in the White House in '88 and beyond, Democrat or Republican.

Maer: Are you still planning on a vote next week on [White House Counselor] Ed Meese's nomination [for U.S. attorney general]?

Dole: I would hope to take it up on Tuesday and have a vote on Wednesday.

Maer: How do you think his credibility and his ability to serve as attorney general will be affected—assuming he is approved by the Senate—by all of the serious ethical questions raised during the course of the past year?

Dole: I would take a look at the source of some of those who raised the questions. I mean, if everybody questioned everyone's ethics, there wouldn't be anybody left in the Capitol. So, I don't think it will have any big impact. My view is there were legitimate questions—most of them were legitimate, some I think were just politics—but I don't see it having any impact. Ed Meese is a fine man. He will be confirmed with a big margin. I think he is going to demonstrate to his critics as well as his supporters, that he will be a very good attorney general.

Maer: Do you think he will run the Justice Department any differently because of what he went through?



Dole: When you have been grilled as long as he has, when you have been waiting a year to be attorney general, when you have had thousands of questions thrown at you, you are going to be very sensitive. He has indicated in his testimony that had he looked at it now as opposed to then, he might have done it differently. So, I assume all of us would react that way.

Fineman: Senator, why is there such a difference between those in the Republican Party who emphasize growth is the way out, and those who want to cut the deficit? Why the difference?

Dole: I am not certain there is a difference. I think there are those who would like to create a difference between some of the House Republicans, and I would guess nearly every Senate Republican. We all believe in growth. We want to expand the economy, but we also believe—and maybe it's because we are in the majority—that growth is fine. Another way to get more growth is to get the deficit down. This

brings in a lot of tough votes some members would rather not have, but I do not really see that difference. I think there are those who would say there is a difference, and that somehow Senate Republicans are the "Old Guard." I do not see anything "Old Guard" about wanting to have a balanced budget. I never considered Dwight Eisenhower to be an Old Guard. He worried about a \$2 billion deficit, now we're worried about \$200 billion a year.

Fineman: You have been called, among other things, the "tax collector of the welfare state" by some of those House Republicans you are referring to. Are they being irresponsible?

Dole: Oh, I do not believe so. I mean, I do not agree with that statement. I think the fellow who called me that said he was going to stop saying things like that. He is going to try to clean up his act, at least in public.

Fineman: At least on the record.

Dole: I think it is a little amusing when you look at all the tax reform we in the Senate did in '82 and '84, condemned by some House Republicans who now want to be the big tax reformers. Maybe they can justify that. They do not have to justify it to me because I believe in tax fairness and reform. But I do not really see this big difference between the Conservative Opportunity Society and all other Republicans. They are not any different than the rest of us. They have to get elected. They are bright, young guys and gals for the most part. We are glad they are Republicans.

Povich: You're now talking about putting together a package, on the Republican side of the Senate, for deficit reduction by sometime in March.

Dole: I hope so. I do not have any date or else they're going to say, "Uh-oh, they didn't meet that date."

Povich: President Reagan says a president should never say never. Assuming that a [Senate] majority leader also should never say never, at what point will you consider something on the revenue side?

Dole: On that point, I just think there is no reason to clutter up the argument with any thought about a tax increase. It is not going to happen. The last resort is a long, long way away and, if we start even hinting about revenue increases, it is going to take the pressure off spending reform. So the president is going to call the shot on that. The American voters called it in November. ■

DOLE THE DEFICIT-CUTTER LOSES HIS FIRST ROUND

The Senate Republicans' preemptive strike on President Reagan's fiscal 1986 budget seems to be fizzling. For now, Bob Dole (R-Kan.), the Senate's new majority leader, has lost his gamble to prove with a single stroke that he could persuade his often unruly GOP colleagues to make difficult choices on the deficit. "A majority leader has to do a lot of little things every day to be a good leader," says one Dole aide. "But if he blows it on the budget, he looks like he's lost control."



BOB DOLE: "I'M SHOWING IT ON THE BUDGET, IT LOOKS LIKE WE'VE LOST CONTROL."

Dole's situation probably isn't that dire, but his first month on the job has been anything but successful. Unable to force GOP conservatives to accept a freeze in military appropriations, he failed to meet his self-imposed Feb. 1 deadline to produce a plan to cut the deficit to \$98 billion in 1988. Moreover, Dole faces a filibuster threat from farm-belt senators, who promise to block all legislation until Dole brings to the floor an expensive rescue bill to help debt-ridden farmers (page 124).

The wisecracking Kansan faces the same problems that plagued his predecessor, Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.). Republican conservatives won't buy

military cuts and tax hikes, and GOP moderates seem as likely as ever to join the Democrats in opposing social-program cuts. Indeed, as Dole passes the budget problem on to Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.), the only budget the Senate may produce will be a bipartisan measure with fewer spending cuts than either the Reagan proposal or Dole's original goal.

Dole will no doubt win his share of legislative battles. He intends to push legislation to overturn a U.S. Supreme Court decision that narrowly defined federal discrimination laws. He will usher several environmental bills through the Senate and may win passage of an elusive bill to rewrite the nation's immigration laws. But even he admits the best prize of all would be a budget coup. "I don't know that I'd like to be known as the guy who saved the budget," he says, "but, as Vince Lombardi once said, it sure beats coming in second."

BUSINESS WEEK, FEBRUARY 16, 1985 31

Dole postpones showdown vote on farm loans

By JIM DRINKARD
AP Farm Writer

WASHINGTON — With hundreds of farm-state lawmakers and governors pressing for action, Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole abruptly delayed a showdown vote on whether to make more emergency loan money available to farmers unable to plant this spring.

Dole announced the postponement, saying he had to leave to make a speech to a civic group in Peoria, Ill., as Democrats pushing for dramatic changes in a federal credit aid program said they believed they may have the votes to pass their amendments. Dole said the vote likely would occur Wednesday.

Asked whether he had the votes to prevail against the Democrats, Dole said: "I don't know. I haven't really counted." Earlier in the day, he had been more optimistic.

"It would appear we're within two votes either way," said Sen. Edward Zorinsky, D-Neb., sponsor of one of the amendments. "This is a litmus test vote on support or non-support of the farmers in America."

The far-reaching amendments under debate were designed to alter a Reagan administration credit-aid program already in effect, but which has been criticized as little more than a "Band-Aid" by Democrats and farm-state Republicans. One, pushed primarily by Zorinsky, would vastly liberalize the administration plan by offering \$100 million to buy down interest rates to financially ailing farmers and by offering 90 percent government backing for farm banks' troubled loans without any requirement that the banks absorb losses. A modified version would require the banks to take some loss, equivalent to at least 10 percent of loan principal.

A second amendment, to be offered by Sen. Alan Dixon, D-Ill., would give farmers immediate 50 percent advances on crop price-support loans, normally not re-

Groups urge rejection of proposed cuts

WASHINGTON (AP) — Saying not just farmers but all of rural life is threatened, more than 200 organizations Tuesday urged Congress to reject President Reagan's proposed budget cuts for programs from farm credit to rural electrification.

The groups, organized as the "Rural Budget Coalition," wrote congressmen that "the nation's rural areas will suffer severely" under Reagan's proposals. They suggested cuts in defense spending and tax increases to solve federal deficits.

They complained Reagan would cut \$12.2 billion from agriculture programs that would, among other things:

- Eliminate all rural housing, rural community development, and Indian housing programs, cutting back Farmers Home Administration operations by more than half.
- Curtail credit to family farms.
- Phase out rural electrification and telephone loans.
- Reduce soil conservation aid.

ceived until harvest time, to provide enough cash to plant crops now.

Both proposals are opposed by the White House, which contends its own credit help moves are the best way to salvage the farmers with the greatest chance of long-term survival while avoiding excessive cost to the Treasury.

At the White House, President Reagan met with Republican congressional leaders and took a firm stand against additional aid for farmers.

Not since Lyndon Johnson has Capitol Hill seen anything like the political skill and tenacity of the shrewd, tart-tongued Senator from Kansas. But is this good news or bad for Ronald Reagan?

Bob Dole: New Strongman in the Senate

By ROWLAND EVANS AND ROBERT NOVAK

"BOSS, I'M READY to go to work," a euphoric Sen. Bob Dole told President Reagan by telephone after his cliff-hanging election as Senate Majority Leader last November. Moments later, however, asked by reporters about his forthcoming relations with the White House, he commented, "Obviously, we'll have some differences."

Dole's victory gave Ronald Reagan his first real rival in the Republican Party since Reagan's nomination for President in 1980. The tall, dark Kansan—considered the "uncrowned

king of the Senate"—before receiving the mantle—may become the first Majority Leader to run for the Presidential nomination since Lyndon B. Johnson in 1960. Even if Dole doesn't run, many believe he will surely be the most dominant congressional operative since LBJ reigned supreme during the 1950s.

The differences between President Reagan and the new Majority Leader are significant. While Reagan is committed to supply-side tax reduction, Dole—one of the most powerful Senate Finance Commi-

tee chairmen of all time during his four-year tenure there—is an old-fashioned balanced-budget Republican not averse to tax increases. (Characteristically, he has carefully left his options open on tax reform.) And while Reagan remains a dedicated foe of the liberal agenda, Dole has become a pragmatist, often supporting an expanded role for government. This, combined with his propensity for tax increases, has led conservative firebrand Rep. Newt Gingrich (R., Ga.) to label Dole "the tax collector for the welfare state."

Dole was elected by his Republican colleagues in part because they expect him to stand up to the White House far more than did recently retired Majority Leader Howard Baker. As Sen. John Warner (R., Va.) puts it, Reagan is now a "lame duck," and the

186

Senate Republicans need a leader to assert their independence.

In fact, the new Majority Leader is at the forefront of the struggle for the post-Reagan course of the Republican Party. It's Dole and the traditionalists versus Rep. Jack Kemp (R., N.Y.) and the Young Turks.

Mover and Shaper. Dole's record as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is awesome. No single legislator has had so quick and decisive an impact on the Internal Revenue Code. Dole personally originated much of the unprecedented body of tax law he guided to passage. Only a year after taking over the Finance Committee in 1981, he was shaping rather than following Administration fiscal strategy. White House Chief of Staff James A. Baker III credited him with being the principal catalyst behind the bipartisan plan

185

BOB DOLE: NEW STRONGMAN IN THE SENATE

187

that bailed out Social Security in 1983 by raising payroll taxes.

Although Dole is a Washington insider, he is not one of the boys. "Behind the wisecracking that he is known for, he is very shy—a loner," says another insider. The Senator and his wife, Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole, almost never entertain at their Watergate apartment and rarely accept dinner invitations. They frequently dine alone at the Jockey Club, the posh restaurant in the Ritz-Carlton Hotel where they celebrated last Thanksgiving.

At age 61, Dole has not shown the inclination, common among Senators, to amass a fortune from public service. The Doles' 1983 income of \$544,572 was entirely unsheltered. They paid federal taxes of \$162,816 and state income taxes of \$31,834. That year, Dole's contributions to

charity totaled \$82,250, all from honorariums for speeches.

A pivotal event of Dole's life occurred on April 14, 1945, while he was leading a platoon of the Tenth Mountain Division in Italy. Dole was hit by a German shell that shattered his right shoulder, arm and part of his spine. When the medics removed him from his foxhole nine hours later, all four limbs were paralyzed. After three years of painful surgery and therapy, he was able to walk again, but his right arm remained crippled beyond repair. Today, he shakes hands and writes with his left hand.

Such determination has become a political hallmark for Dole. He began his career in the Kansas legislature while still in law school. In 1969, a few days before Richard M. Nixon entered the White House,

Reader Digest - March, 1985

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE